

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Filed herewith is a replacement drawing sheet for Fig. 7. It is respectfully requested that the replacement drawing sheet be substituted for the originally filed drawing sheet for Fig. 7. An extra copy of the original drawing sheet for Fig. 7, with changes indicated thereon, is also filed herewith.

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed September 27, 2006. Currently, claims 1-32 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 7, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 25 – 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-32.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

Claims 26-31 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 1, 6-7, 17, 19, 21-22, 25, 27, and 29-32 were objected to because of containing informalities.

Claims 25-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27 and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Chen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,429).

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27 and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Hosono et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,344).

Claims 6-8, 15-16, 21-23 and 28-30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Summary of the Amendments

Claims 1, 6, 7, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 25 – 32 are amended.

III. Remarks

Corrections to the Abstract, Drawing and specification are submitted herein. It is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are now moot.

It is respectfully submitted claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27 and 31-32 are not anticipated by *Hosono et al.* As indicated in the attached DECLARATION OF JIAN CHEN, ET AL.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.131, the subject matter of the claims in the instant application was invented prior to the earliest date available under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for *Hosono et al.*.

It is respectfully submitted claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27 and 31-32 are not anticipated by *Chen, et al.* as *Chen, et al.* fails to disclose:

determining whether the adjacent word line a threshold voltage greater than a check voltage; and

if the data state of the adjacent word line is above a check voltage, reading a selected bit in word line WLn by selectively adjusting at least one read parameter.

Similar limitations are present in independent claims 17, 24 and 32.

Chen, et al. discloses reading the states of adjacent cells, determining the effect of the cells and adjusting the sensing threshold levels of the read circuitry. There is no determination relative to a “check voltage” nor of only making the adjustment relative to the state of the check voltage. *Chen, et al.* specifically discloses:

A preferred compensated read technique is illustrated in FIGS. 9 and 10. A first step 171 indicates that an address of a group of cells to be read in parallel, in this case an entire row, is first received from the controller 23 (FIG. 1). In a next step 173, adjacent cells that are field coupled with those of the addressed row are identified and their states read with the standard breakpoint levels 101, 103 and 105 (FIG. 10). These readings are then multiplied by the coupling ratio between each of the adjacent cells and the cells of the addressed row being read, as part of a step 175. These multiplied readings are then combined, also as part of the step 175, in order to determine the collective effect of the adjacent cells on each of the cells of the addressed row being read. (Col. 8, lines 6 – 19).

In *Chen, et al.*, there is no step of: “...determining whether the adjacent word line a threshold voltage greater than a check voltage...” and consequently “reading... by selectively adjusting at least one read parameter.... if the data state of the adjacent word line is above a

check voltage” (emphasis supplied). Because each and every limitation of the claimed invention is not disclosed by *Chen, et al.*, it is respectfully submitted *Chen, et al.* does not anticipate claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27 and 31-32.

As noted above, similar limitations are present in independent claims 17, 25 and 32.

Claim 17 provides:

determining whether a bit adjacent to the selected bit has a threshold voltage greater than a check voltage; and
if the adjacent bit has a threshold voltage greater than the check value, reading the selected bit in said first word line by selectively adjusting at least one read parameter.

Claim 25 provides:

reading an adjacent row line written after the first row line;
determining whether a bit adjacent to the selected bit has a threshold voltage greater than a check voltage; and
if the adjacent bit has a threshold voltage greater than the check value, reading the selected bit in the first row line by selectively adjusting at least one read parameter.

And claim 32 provides:

means for determining whether a bit adjacent to the selected bit has a threshold voltage greater than a check value; and
means for reading the selected bit in the first word line by selectively adjusting at least one read parameter if the adjacent bit has a threshold voltage greater than the check value.

For the reasons set for the above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted claims 17, 25 and 32, as well as claims 2-5, 9-14, 18-20, 24, 26-27 and 31, dependent from claims 17 and 25 and including all the limitations thereof, are not anticipated by *Chen, et al.*.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of Claims 1 – 32 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner’s prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, March 27, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 27, 2007

By: /Larry E. Vierra/
Larry E. Vierra
Reg. No. 33,809

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: 415.369.9660
Facsimile: 415.369.9665